

General Fund Projects

IT Plan – Agency Version - IT Cap

108 SECRETARY OF STATE

Version: 2009-A-01-00108

Project: INF-001 North Dakota Business Development Engine

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:08 AM

Page 14 of 17

Agency Priority - 1

Project Type: New initiative

Project description

The Business Development Engine (BDE) is an automated online system that provides a streamlined environment enabling new and existing businesses easier interaction with North Dakota State Agencies. The engine also provides prospective businesses with greater researching functionality resulting in additional opportunities for growth and expansion while moving North Dakota to an ever-stronger economy. The SOS office will manage the project funding along with an interagency governance structure. North Dakota Business Development Engine Executive Summary

The Business Development Engine is an automated online system that provides a streamlined environment enabling new and existing businesses easier interaction with North Dakota State Agencies. In so doing, new businesses can become operational much quicker and existing businesses can do their reporting of information much more efficiently. The engine also provides prospective businesses with greater researching functionality resulting in additional opportunities for growth and expansion while moving North Dakota to an ever-stronger economy.

The Business Development Engine is the next evolutionary step for businesses to interact with government. This is a natural progression from businesses interacting with government using paper or agency specific online forms to an online "One-Stop Streamlined Environment", allowing businesses to electronically interact with over 15 agencies 24 hours a day every day through a single common interface.

Business Development Engine Components

- ☐ New Business Registration
- ☐ Existing Business Maintenance and Reporting
- ☐ Public Inquiry
- ☐ Government to Government Interfaces

Primary Benefits to Business Development

- ☐ Single point of contact with State Government will reduce agency interfaces from over 15 agencies to 1 resulting in significant time savings for the business
- ☐ Expedites creation of new business resulting in faster achievement of earned income for the business
- ☐ Improve business compliancy which minimizes penalties incurred by businesses and confirms that all requirements have been satisfied and fulfilled
- ☐ Promotes a good working relationship between business and state government.
- ☐ Access to information of services and products available in North Dakota
- ☐ Allows an entrepreneur to confidentially research potential markets and determine feasibility of new business
- ☐ Provides customer assurance that all businesses are being held to the same standards

Cost and Time Estimate

- ☐ One-Time Cost: \$3,000,000 over 27 months. This includes the analysis of business and agency requirements, system design and development, implementation of hardware and software, project management, and agency business application integrations.
- ☐ The one-time cost to implement the engine provides years of savings to business and agencies at minimal annual maintenance costs. On-going annual maintenance is estimated to be \$90,000 per year, covering hardware and software maintenance.

IT Plan – Agency Version - IT Cap

108 SECRETARY OF STATE

Version: 2009-A-01-00108

Project: INF-001 North Dakota Business Development Engine

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:08 AM

Page 15 of 17

Governance

A governance structure would be established similar to Criminal Justice Information Sharing (CJIS) or Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to set policy, strategic direction, and ensure the engine meets the needs of business and government agencies.

Supporting Agencies

The following agencies supported the study which resulted in this recommendation to implement the Business Development Engine:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Bank of North Dakota | Office of the Attorney General |
| Department of Commerce | Secretary of State |
| Department of Transportation | Tax Department |
| Information Technology Department | Workforce Safety and Insurance |
| Office of Management and Budget | |

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

The BDE is the next evolutionary step for businesses to interact with government. This is a natural progression from businesses interacting with government using paper or agency specific online forms to an online "One-Stop Streamlined Environment", allowing businesses to electronically interact with over 15 agencies 24 hours a day every day through a single common interface.

The Secretary of State's office and ITD developed an effective PowerPoint that does a good job showing the "spider web" of connections that North Dakota businesses have with state government. That PowerPoint could not be attached within BARS, but it can certainly be made available to any who would like to see the tremendous need in the form of a picture representation.

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

The BDE will help state government to better serve the people, it will help state agencies complete the duties assigned to them by the Constitution and Century Code in an ever growing economy, it will help state government to properly collect and preserve the records of the state, and it will showcase the reality that in North Dakota, government is taking giant strides forward to excellence in operating for the people.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

Single point of contact with state government - significant time savings for the business / Expedites new business creation - faster achievement of earned income for the business / Improve business compliancy - confirms all business requirements have been satisfied and fulfilled / Promotes positive working relationship between business and government / Better access to information for feasibility studies

Describe the impact of not implementing the project

IT Plan – Agency Version - IT Cap

108 SECRETARY OF STATE

Version: 2009-A-01-00108

Project: INF-001 North Dakota Business Development Engine

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:08 AM

Page 16 of 17

Business and state government needs this tool now. Waiting will only make the costs grow and we will continue to make it cumbersome for the business world to stay in compliance with state government. The longer we wait on this, the more we will all lose on the tremendous business intelligence that could be produced from simply connecting the data gathered by the agencies connecting with the businesses of the state.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

No state has taken this type of project to the level proposed. This would mean that we are traveling new territory. This risk is mitigated, however, since we've done this type of project with CJS and the Master Client Index is currently under construction. We will learn the lessons from these two projects, which will help us to move to completion at a faster pace. Legislation will need to be reviewed to allow full benefit of this tool, but "pro business" legislation receives great support.

Describe the additional costs?

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?

Additional Costs? -

\$0

Optional Project Costs -

\$0

Total Project Cost? -

\$3,000,000

Total Project Costs + Optionals -

\$3,000,000

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?

None

Explanation of Financial Impact.

ITD estimates that the BDE will require \$90,000 per year or \$180,000 per biennium to cover hardware and software maintenance. This will be a direct cost for the state each biennium, but the more online services the state can provide to its customers and the more connections that can be made between agencies maintaining data on these same customers, the more efficient state government will become. In future years, agencies will either be able to reduce the number of staff currently necessary to handle all paper filings or they will be able to give new duties to those same employees rather than requesting additional staff.

We placed \$0.00 in this field under funding and expenditures simply because it is impossible for us to know how much of a return on investment will be realized from state agencies.

IT Plan - Agency Version - IT Cap

108 SECRETARY OF STATE

Version: 2009-A-01-00108

Project: INF-001 North Dakota Business Development Engine

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:08 AM

Page 17 of 17

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNIMUM |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| IT5310 IT SOFTWARE AND SUPPLIES | \$0 | | \$3,000,000 | \$3,000,000 | \$190,000 |
| Total Budget: | \$0 | | \$3,000,000 | \$3,000,000 | \$190,000 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,000,000 | \$3,000,000 | \$190,000 |
| Total Funding: | \$0 | | \$3,000,000 | \$3,000,000 | \$190,000 |

AGENCY:

PROJECT:

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | | 15 | 0 |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 15 | 0 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 15 | 0 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | | | |
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|----------|------------------------|-----------|----------|
| Number of Benefits | 3 | Sub-total Score | 45 | 0 |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | | | |
| Highest Benefit Score | | | 15 | 0 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|--------------|---------------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. | | 5 | 0 |
| Score: | | | |
| 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. | | | |
| 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. | | | |
| 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. | | | |
| Confidence measure (C.M.): | | | |
| 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. | | | |
| 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. | | | |
| 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | | | |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 20 | 0 |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|---|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. | | | |
| Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): | | | |
| IT budget request \$ <u>3,400,698</u> General funds <u>100</u> % _____ \$ | | | |
| Other project costs \$ <u>0</u> General funds <u>0</u> % _____ \$ | | | |
| Total project cost \$ <u>3,400,698</u> General funds <u>100</u> % _____ \$ | | | |
| B. Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. | | | |
| Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): | | | |
| Change in operating cost \$ <u>108,756</u> General funds <u>100</u> % _____ \$ | | | |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | 3,726,966 | 3,726,966 |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | 37.27 | 37.27 |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | 3,726,966 | 3,726,966 |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | 37.27 | 37.27 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | Score |
|---|-----------|
| <p>Score all risks from the following list.</p> <p>A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors.</p> | |
| <p>A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified.</p> <p>2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named.</p> | 5 |
| <p>B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk).</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology.</p> <p>2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized.</p> | 5 |
| <p>C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months.</p> <p>2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months.</p> <p>0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete.</p> | 0 |
| <p>D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services.</p> <p>2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified.</p> | 3 |
| Total Score | 13 |

This document contains a list of automated services that will provide a streamlined relational environment between new and existing North Dakota businesses and state government through which businesses are provided faster reporting tools and greater researching functions resulting in additional opportunities for growth and expansion while moving North Dakota to an ever-stronger economy. The intent of this project is to enhance the connectivity between state agencies in regard to North Dakota business data using Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) technologies. SOA technology allows agency applications to be integrated without replacing any agency systems.

Through this system, business owners will be granted the opportunity to relate to state government in the manner in which they are most comfortable. Whether their interaction of choice is paper or electronic filings directly with each agency or through a common connection that disperses the correct information to each agency, the business owner will be in control. However, by creating this system of interagency connectivity, every business owner will be assured that all required relationships with state government are in place. Additionally every state agency working with businesses in North Dakota will be able to stay as current as possible on each business regardless of how the business owner interfaces with state government. This is a win-win for business and state governmental operations.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Business to Government Interface</i> | 2 |
| New Business Creation | 2 |
| <i>Existing Business Maintenance</i> | 2 |
| Business Profile Maintenance and Query | 2 |
| Periodic Business Reporting | 3 |
| Business Reminders | 4 |
| <i>Public Inquiry</i> | 4 |
| Public Query of Business Information | 4 |
| <i>Government to Government Interface</i> | 5 |
| Agency Notification | 5 |
| <i>Agency Enhancements</i> | 5 |
| Agency Specific Enhancement | 5 |

Business to Government Interface**New Business Creation**

Allow a new business to register with the State of ND via an interactive web site. This web site would assist the new business owner when registering by only requiring the information necessary for that particular business based on well defined business rules. It would also automatically submit the appropriate information electronically to each agency as necessary.

Business Benefits:

1. Customer enters information only once which ensures consistency, requires less effort, and saves time.
2. Eliminates confusion as the system identifies all requirements for the specific business situation.
3. Expedite the interface between the new business and state government agencies.
4. Businesses could use the process during their feasibility study to determine potential costs, requirements, and opportunities.
5. Allow the business to submit one payment that will be disbursed by the system to agencies according to fee requirements.
6. Businesses only need to retain one unique identifier which would allow them to interact with all agencies.

Agency Benefits:

1. Consistency of data across all agencies.
2. Businesses are identified by a unique identifier which would eliminate confusion between agency records.
3. Information is dispersed to agencies according to the established interagency business rules.
4. Eliminate duplication efforts and costs between state agencies since information is entered only once by the business.
5. Expedite the interface between the new business and state government agencies.

Existing Business Maintenance**Business Profile Maintenance and Query**

Allow an agency to electronically access and maintain the information for a specific business. Agencies will remain in control of the data within their systems. The system would build the business profile by retrieving all the business information from each participating agency at the time the business profile is requested. The information returned would contain only shareable information such as: Registration information, current license information, the current status of the business and its state accounts such as Tax, WSI, or JSND.

Business Benefits:

1. Information is consistent for all agencies.
2. Allows businesses the capability of easily modifying their information through the common state government interface. For example, an address

change is done by one agency and all agencies will receive the corrected information.

3. Significantly reduces the margin of error for the business to inadvertently provide incorrect information to state government.

Agency Benefits:

1. Information is consistent for all agencies.
2. Provides an agency with one stop to obtain all business information and documents.
3. Expedite investigation for Law Enforcement and other regulatory, licensing, and granting agencies.
4. Expedite the collection of past due ND state government obligations from businesses.

Periodic Business Reporting

Allow a registered business to submit their statutorily required business information in a consolidated manner to state agencies via an interactive website. For example, a corporation could file its corporate tax return, Work Force Safety payroll report, Job Service employer's contribution and wage report, license renewals, Secretary of State annual report, and any other government agency reports in a single effort. The system will only require the user to enter the information that is necessary for their particular type of business. The system would automatically submit the appropriate information electronically to each agency's existing data system as necessary. Each agency would only be provided the information that the law allows them to receive.

Business Benefits:

1. Customer enters information only once which ensures consistency, requires less effort, and saves time.
2. Eliminates confusion as the system identifies all requirements for the specific business situation.
3. Expedite the interface between the business and state government agencies.
4. Allow the business to submit one payment that will be disbursed by the system to agencies according to fee requirements.
5. Upon submittal, the system would immediately provide confirmation to the business that all requirements have been satisfied or identify any requirements left to fulfill.

Agency Benefits:

1. Time savings for agencies by virtue of electronic filing.
2. Consistency of data across all agencies.
3. Information is dispersed to agencies according to the established interagency business rules.
4. Eliminate duplication efforts and costs between state agencies since information is entered only once by the business.
5. Expedite the interface between the business and state government agencies.
6. Encourages businesses to use online system vs. paper forms.

Business Reminders

Electronic reminders will automatically be sent to a business by the system. The reminders will be generated based upon predetermined events according to business needs. For example, a filing event such as an approaching renewal deadline or the filing of a merger which affects all licenses held by the non-surviving entity would cause a reminder to be sent. Reminders could be sent in the form of emails, recorded messages, etc.

Business Benefits:

1. Business is more likely to avoid late filing penalties.
2. System will help businesses remain compliant with every participating state agency.
3. Promotes a good working relationship between business and state government.

Agency Benefits:

1. Agency will save cost of notifying late filers and painstaking collection of penalties.

Public Inquiry**Public Query of Business Information**

Allow a public user to electronically access the open records information of a business for research purposes. The system would allow a user to search for businesses using criteria such as: business name, business id number, and/or nature of business activities. The business information will be retrieved from each participating agency at the time the search is performed.

Business Benefits:

1. Information provided is the most current available.
2. Easily provide statistical information to businesses such as total number of businesses engaged in a similar enterprise.
3. Possibly identify an industry group for eligibility of grants.
4. Identify industry groups for business purpose within a trade area. For example, a business can locate a provider in close proximity, which potentially enhances opportunities for ND businesses.
5. An expanded list of nature of business activities would allow for a more comprehensive search result.
6. Allows an entrepreneur to confidentially research potential markets.

Agency Benefits:

1. An expanded list of nature of business activities would allow for a more comprehensive search result for such tasks as legislative fiscal forecasting.
2. Granting agencies can identify the eligible businesses.
3. Allow an agency to research market gaps for future business development.
4. Agency receives fewer calls for market information because the business can do their own research.

Government to Government Interface**Agency Notification**

An electronic notification will be sent automatically to each participating agency when something occurs that could affect the business' standing in ND. The events that would trigger a notification to be sent would be determined by participating agencies based on established business rules and laws. For example, merger, conversion, business name change, dissolution, consolidation, change of a business status, delinquent taxes or other accounts, etc.

Business Benefits:

1. When a critical business event occurs, all participating agencies will be informed.
2. This affords the business owner a strong sense of comfort in knowing that they haven't forgotten a critical piece of the puzzle.
3. Provides customer assurance that all businesses are being held to the same standards.

Agency Benefits:

1. Agencies are simultaneously informed of critical business events. For example, licensing agencies would be notified immediately when a corporate charter is revoked.

Agency Enhancements**Agency Specific Enhancement**

Each agency will determine their particular needs and customizations that will compliment their current processes.

- Attorney General
- Entrepreneur Centers of North Dakota
- Central Duplicating Services – OMB
- Central Services Div. - OMB
- Commerce Dept
- Dept of Agriculture
- Dept of Labor
- Human Services
- IRS
- Job Service
- NDSU Extension Service
- SCORE
- Secretary of State
- Small Business Development Center
- Tax Department
- Workforce Safety and Insurance

IT Plan – IT Version

110 OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Version: 2009-A-10-00110

Project: CND-001 Business Intelligence and Data Warehouse

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:15 AM

Page 5 of 7

Agency Priority - 1

Project Type: Ongoing initiative

Project description

The project is a PeopleSoft finance and human resources Business Intelligence Reporting System (BIRS) that delivers operational and analytical reports. The project will continue implementation, configuration, support and end-user training. The project will have the ND Information Technology Department host and administer an integrated BIRS for PeopleSoft.

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

At the conclusion of the ConnectND HCM and Fin PeopleSoft implementation end user reporting was very limited regarding accessing transactional data and the impact on the transactional system limits the reporting made available. The Office of Management and Budget and state agencies have provided reporting, technical and other additional business needs regarding accessing and presenting the PeopleSoft data.

Reporting needs include:

End users without IT experience request a user friendly tool to access data and create reports. Users should feel empowered from user friendly self-service reporting and query environment. The tool should be intuitive for Business/Functional users to create queries, reports and distribute reports. Managers and IT Coordinators need the capability of publishing information; ie; report distribution, bursting, and portal integration. Management needs ability to monitor Key Performance Indicators (KPI) or metrics for HR and FIN for response to exceptions in a timely fashion by drilling into the KPI or metric details.

The solution should provide predefined reports and the ability to run queries and reports on demand without impacting the production transactional system. The data pulled into queries needs to be easily identifiable/recognized from a business/functional perspective.

Technology related needs include:

Ability for ITTD to deploy, maintain, build and deploy additional data marts. Affordable to purchase and support. Has high availability and is scalable. Uses security standards (authenticate and application level security).

Additional business needs include:

Shadow systems continue to be used for reporting, budgeting and forecasting. By reducing the copies of data used in algorithms for key metrics and establishing consistent metrics and terminology, overall consistency and quality of data can be improved. Reduce data in transactional system for improved performance. Retain more years of data in a reporting system. Produce query results without impacting production and in an acceptable response time. Provide an environment capable of expanding the user base beyond back office financial and HR staff to front line program managers. Provide public access to data or means of publishing the data for the public.

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

The current OMB mission is to provide a range of products and services resulting in a well run government that meets the needs of North Dakota citizens. The current Fiscal Management mission is to provide our customers with services and support for fiscal operations that result in timely and reliable financial data.

The successful completion of this project will result in more timely financial information. With the consistent and validated information, decision makers can be better informed.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

IT Plan – IT Version

I10 OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Version: 2009-A-10-00110

Project: CND-001 Business Intelligence and Data Warehouse

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:15 AM

Page 6 of 7

This project is to provide a business intelligence reporting environment for the PeopleSoft Finance and Human Resources information system, including a toolset, implementation/configuration, support services, and trained end-users. A benefit of the extract, transform and load (ETL) process is the cleansing of data into consistent information; one version of the truth.

Describe the impact of not implementing the project

If this project is not implemented, the status quo will remain. Good government can become better government. By not implementing this project the transactional system performance will continue to deteriorate. Upon successful completion of this project, the current reporting environment will be eliminated. This project will provide the ability to expand the user base to front line program managers and provide information to the public.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

With any IT project, implementation and configuration are of utmost importance. Implementation risk can be mitigated by ensuring the appropriate hardware is in place to handle the analytical processing necessary to produce timely results. Configuration risk can be mitigated by ensuring IT and business staff have a thorough understanding of the ETL process.

Describe the additional costs?

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?

Additional Costs? -

Optional Project Costs -

Total Project Cost? -

Tot Proj Costs + Optionals -

\$0
\$0

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?

None.

Explanation of Financial Impact.

The financial impact of this project has not been analyzed. The benefits of better information and more informed decisions by our government in the future will cost money. We predict those decisions will also produce a more stable economic environment for our state.

IT Plan - IT Version

Date: 8/4/2008

110 OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Time: 8:15 AM

Version: 2009-A-10-00110

Page 7 of 7

Project: CND-001 Business Intelligence and Data Warehouse

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNIAL |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| IT6030 IT CONTRACT SERVICES & REPAIRS | \$0 | \$500,000 | \$0 | \$500,000 | \$0 |
| Total Budget: | \$0 | \$500,000 | \$0 | \$500,000 | \$0 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$0 | \$500,000 | \$0 | \$500,000 | \$0 |
| Total Funding: | \$0 | \$500,000 | \$0 | \$500,000 | \$0 |

Project Business Case

Project Name: Business Intelligence / Data Warehouse

Project Short Name: BI/Data Warehouse

Agency: OMB

Business Unit/Program Area: Fiscal Management

Type of Project: New Initiative

Date: 08/01/2008

Version: 1

Project Description:

Deploy a data warehouse and business intelligence tools to State Agencies. The data warehouse and business intelligence tools will be used to perform analysis of data; publish reports; monitor key performance indicators (metrics); create ad hoc reporting; etc.; (see details below). The data warehouse will contain data from the PeopleSoft Human Capital Management and Financials applications. It will be integrated with other source data systems to provide analysis / reporting capability of financial and non-financial data.

Business Need/Problem:

At the conclusion of the ConnectND HCM and Fin PeopleSoft implementation end user reporting was very limited regarding accessing transactional data and the impact on the transactional system limits the reporting made available. The Office of Management and Budget and State agencies list the following business needs regarding accessing and presenting the PeopleSoft data:

I. Reporting needs include:

- End users without IT experience requested a user friendly tool to access data and create reports. Empower users through user friendly self-service reporting and query environment
- The tool should be intuitive for Business/Functional users to create queries, reports and distribute reports
- Managers and IT Coordinators need the capability of publishing info. (ie; Report distribution, Bursting, Portal integration).
- Ability for management to monitor Key Performance Indicators (metric) for HR and FIN and respond to exceptions in a timely fashion. Drilling into the details of these KPI's
- The solution should provide predefined reports and ability to run on demand
- While end users build reports the data pulled into queries needs to be easily identifiable/recognized from a Business/Functional perspective
- Run ad hoc reports without impacting production transactional system (Reports run on demand)

II. Additional business needs:

- Shadow systems continue to be used for reporting, budgeting and forecasting. By reducing the copies of data which can potentially alter algorithms for key metrics, this improves the overall consistency and quality of data; establish consistent metrics and terminology
- Reduce data in transactional system for performance
- Retain more years of data in a reporting system
- Produce Query Results without impacting production and in an acceptable response time

Project Business Case

- Provide an environment capable of expanding the user base beyond back office financial and HR staff to front line program managers
- Public access of data or means of publishing to the public

Solution (as described in Proposed Solution):

Purchase and deploy a data warehouse and business intelligence tool to state agencies.

Consistency/Fit with Organization's Mission:

At the conclusion of the ConnectND HCM and Fin PeopleSoft implementation end user reporting was very limited regarding accessing transactional data and the impact on the transactional system limits the reporting made available. Earlier this year OMB conducted a customer survey and reporting was frequently mentioned as one of the major weaknesses of PeopleSoft. A data warehouse/BI tool has been listed on the ConnectND Strategic Plan since May 2005.

Cost Benefit Analysis

Anticipated Benefits:

Refer to the Business Need / Problem section above.

Cost Estimate:

In excess of \$500,000. An RFP was issued July 10, 2008 and proposals are scheduled to be evaluated by mid October 2008. The project will be paid from General Funds and we anticipate a charge-back to customers as part of the ConnectND fee but we do not know what it will be at this time.

Cost/Benefit Analysis:

At this time we do not know what the costs will be. A RFP was issued and proposals are scheduled to be evaluated by mid October 2008.

Project Risks:

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|----------------------------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | | 5 6 | -1 |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 10 4 | 6 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 10 3 | 7 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | | N/A | N/A |
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | | N/A | N/A |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--|--|
| Number of Benefits | 3 | Sub-total Score | | |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | | | |
| Highest Benefit Score | | | | |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|--------------------------------|--------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. Score: 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | | 5 1 | 4 |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|--|--|-------------|---------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): IT budget request \$ 500,000 General funds 100% \$500,000 Other project costs \$ _____ General funds _____ % _____ \$ Total project cost \$ 500,000 General funds 100% \$500,000 | | | |
| B. Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): Change in operating cost \$1.0m General funds 100% \$1.0m | | | |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | | |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | | |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | | |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | Score |
|---|-----------|
| <p>Score all risks from the following list.</p> <p>A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors.</p> | |
| <p>A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified.</p> <p>2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named.</p> | 3 |
| <p>B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk).</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology.</p> <p>2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized.</p> | 2 |
| <p>C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months.</p> <p>2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months.</p> <p>0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete.</p> | 3 |
| <p>D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services.</p> <p>2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified.</p> | 3 |
| Total Score | 11 |

IT Plan – IT Plan - Submit

112 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: A-001 K-12 PowerSchool Hosting

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 8 of 34

Agency Priority - 21 Project Type: Major enhancement/upgrade

Project description

This project would provide general funds to allow all schools to utilize PowerSchool for student administration and reporting.

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

This is part of the Governor's initiative to fund K-12 education in the North Dakota. It would provide general funds to allow all schools to utilize PowerSchool for student administration and reporting.

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

ITD provides PowerSchool hosting today for about half of the students in North Dakota. This initiative is part of Governor Hoeven's goal of providing equal learning opportunities for students across the State of North Dakota.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

The benefits of this project include a consistent student administration and reporting interface for all K-12 students and would be funded from the general fund.

Describe the impact of not implementing the project.

Only selected schools would have access to the PowerSchool system.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

ITD will need to work with schools will need to develop implementation plans so that the system provides value and accurate data as we roll out staggered implementation schedules.

Describe the additional costs?

None

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?
Additional Costs? - \$0
Optional Project Costs - \$0
Total Project Cost? - \$3,180,000
Tot Proj Costs + Optionals - \$3,180,000

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?

IT Plan - IT Plan - Submit

112 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: A-001 K-12 PowerSchool Hosting

None

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 9 of 34

IT Plan - IT Plan - Submit

112 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: A-001 K-12 PowerSchool Hosting

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 10 of 34

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNIAL |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| IT5111 ADDITIONAL SALARIES | \$0 | \$1,248,000 | \$0 | \$1,248,000 | \$1,250,000 |
| IT5310 IT SOFTWARE AND SUPPLIES | \$0 | \$1,332,000 | \$0 | \$1,332,000 | \$1,350,000 |
| IT6930 IT EQUIPMENT OVER \$5000 | \$0 | \$600,000 | \$0 | \$600,000 | \$300,000 |
| Total Budget: | \$0 | \$3,180,000 | \$0 | \$3,180,000 | \$2,900,000 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$0 | \$3,180,000 | \$0 | \$3,180,000 | \$2,900,000 |
| Total Funding: | \$0 | \$3,180,000 | \$0 | \$3,180,000 | \$2,900,000 |

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | | 6 | 3 |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 13 | 1 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 12 | 3 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 11 | 0 |
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 15 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|------|-----|
| | Number of Benefits | Sub-total Score | 57 | 49 |
| | Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | 11.4 | 9.8 |
| | Highest Benefit Score | | 15 | 3 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. | | | |
| Score: | | | |
| 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. | | 5 | |
| 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. | | | |
| 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. | | | |
| Confidence measure (C.M.): | | | |
| 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. | | | 0 |
| 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. | | | |
| 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | | | |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 16.4 | 9.8 |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 20 | 3 |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|--|--|-------------|---------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. | | | |
| Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): | | | |
| IT budget request \$ 3,180,000 General funds 100% \$3,180,000 | | | |
| Other project costs \$ General funds % \$ | | | |
| Total project cost \$ 3,180,000 General funds 100% \$3,180,000 | | | |
| B. Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. | | | |
| Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): | | | |
| Change in operating cost \$ 1,450,000 General funds 100% \$1,450,000 | | | |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | 7,530,000 | |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | 75.3 | |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | 7,530,000 | |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | 75.3 | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | Score |
|---|-----------|
| <p>Score all risks from the following list.</p> <p>A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors.</p> | |
| <p>A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified.</p> <p>2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named.</p> | 5 |
| <p>B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk).</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology.</p> <p>2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized.</p> | 5 |
| <p>C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months.</p> <p>2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months.</p> <p>0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete.</p> | 3 |
| <p>D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services.</p> <p>2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified.</p> | 3 |
| Total Score | 16 |

IT Plan - IT Plan - Submit

112 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: C-001 Data Center Remodel

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 14 of 34

Agency Priority - 30 Project Type: Major enhancement/upgrade

Project description

This project is to remodel the existing data center and obtain general funds for one-time costs associated with the remodeling effort.

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

The data center was designed and constructed as part of the Judicial Wing addition to the State Capitol. It is approaching thirty (30) years old and was designed for the technologies of the 1970's and 1980's. Consulting studies have indicated that we will run out of space in the current computer room in three (3) to seven (7) years. In addition there are significant changes planned for the computer room network to increase the security posture of the data center.

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

ITD's mission statement is "Provide leadership and knowledge to assist our customers in achieving their mission through the innovative use of information technology." In 2003 the State Legislature required ITD to provide data center services (ND Century Code Chapter 54-59-22). By law, ITD is charged with providing information technology services to most executive branch agencies. Therefore an adequate data center is required to provide those services.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

- More efficiently and cost effectively provide for state government information technology needs.
- Space for growth to handle the increase in information technology requirements for the next 20 to 30 years.
- More efficient migration to new technology.
- Better able to support business continuity for government due to the modern design and information technology architecture.

Describe the impact of not implementing the project.

There is an increasing risk of interruption to government services due to the age, design, and size of the current data center.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

Continuity of business process is the primary risk. Accordingly a detailed project plan with cutover dates will be prepared and a dedicated project manager will be assigned.

Describe the additional costs?

Besides IT object codes there will be significant building and infrastructure costs to remodel the existing facilities.

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?

Additional Costs? -

\$750,000

Optional Project Costs -

\$0

IT Plan - IT Plan - Submit

112 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: C-001 Data Center Remodel

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 15 of 34

Total Project Cost? -

\$1,635,000

Tot Proj Costs + Optionals -

\$1,635,000

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?
None

IT Plan - IT Plan - Submit

112 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: C-001 Data Center Remodel

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 16 of 34

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNIAL |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| IT6010 IT DATA PROCESSING | \$0 | \$135,000 | \$0 | \$135,000 | \$0 |
| IT6930 IT EQUIPMENT OVER \$5000 | \$0 | \$1,500,000 | \$0 | \$1,500,000 | \$0 |
| Total Budget: | \$0 | \$1,635,000 | \$0 | \$1,635,000 | \$0 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$0 | \$1,635,000 | \$0 | \$1,635,000 | \$0 |
| Total Funding: | \$0 | \$1,635,000 | \$0 | \$1,635,000 | \$0 |

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | | 3 | 6 |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 11 | 3 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 10 | 4 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 10 | 2 |
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 10 | 2 |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Number of Benefits | Sub-total Score | 44 | 17 |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | 8.8 | 3.4 |
| Highest Benefit Score | | 11 | 6 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|--|--|--------------|--------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. Score: 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | | 5 | 0 |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 13.8 | 3.4 |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 16 | 6 |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|--|--|--------------|---------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): IT budget request \$ <u>1,635,000</u> General funds <u>100%</u> <u>\$1,635,000</u> Other project costs \$ _____ General funds _____ % _____ \$ Total project cost \$ <u>1,635,000</u> General funds <u>100%</u> <u>\$1,635,000</u> | | | |
| B. Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): Change in operating cost \$ _____ General funds _____ % _____ \$ | | | |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | 1,635,000 | |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | 16.35 | |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | 1,635,000 | |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | 16.35 | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | Score |
|---|-----------|
| <p>Score all risks from the following list.</p> <p>A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors.</p> | |
| <p>A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified.</p> <p>2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named.</p> | 4 |
| <p>B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk).</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology.</p> <p>2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized.</p> | 3 |
| <p>C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months.</p> <p>2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months.</p> <p>0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete.</p> | 3 |
| <p>D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services.</p> <p>2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified.</p> | 2 |
| Total Score | 12 |

IT Plan – IT Plan - Submit

112 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: CJIS-002 CJIS Project Pool

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 20 of 34

Agency Priority - 14 Project Type: New initiative

Project description

This project consists of multiple projects to enhance the value of the current CJIS hub to its stakeholders

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

The CJIS Board has identified the following projects as priorities for the 2009-2011 biennium:

- Justware Prosecution and Disposition to BCI
- Medium Sized Law Enforcement RMS interface
- Portal 3.0 (Search Capabilities/Page Enhancements)
- Portal - User Role and Security Management
- State's Attorney (Justware) Interface
- CJ Business Process Study
- Portal - Federal (NCIC) Search
- BCI RMS Interface
- DNA Interface
- Highway Patrol Interface
- DOCR RMS Interface

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

The CJIS vision is to: Improve public safety by providing effective and efficient justice policies, processes, and information systems required to capture and share complete, accurate, and timely information in support of program operations and informed decision making across jurisdictional and organizational boundaries statewide.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

Convenient access to information improves decision-making at all points in the criminal justice process from arrest to sentencing.

Shared statewide applications reduce the cost to individual agencies and facilitate shared training opportunities.

Officer and citizen safety is improved by timely access to criminal data.

Describe the impact of not implementing the project.

Important CJIS data will continue to be available to only selected agencies that maintain that data locally.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

IT Plan – IT Plan - Submit

112 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: CJS-002 CJS Project Pool

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 21 of 34

Lack of available funding and development resources.

Describe the additional costs?

None

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?

Additional Costs? -

\$0

Optional Project Costs -

\$0

Total Project Cost? -

\$1,327,535

Tot Proj Costs + Optionals -

\$1,327,535

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?

None

IT Plan – IT Plan - Submit

112 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: CJS-002 CJS Project Pool

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 22 of 34

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNIAL |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| IT6010 IT DATA PROCESSING | \$300,000 | \$527,500 | \$0 | \$527,500 | \$250,000 |
| IT6030 IT CONTRACT SERVICES & REPAIRS | \$1,015,000 | \$800,035 | \$0 | \$800,035 | \$550,000 |
| Total Budget: | \$1,315,000 | \$1,327,535 | \$0 | \$1,327,535 | \$800,000 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$1,015,000 | \$1,027,535 | \$0 | \$1,027,535 | \$500,000 |
| G149 CJS GRANT | \$300,000 | \$300,000 | \$0 | \$300,000 | \$300,000 |
| Total Funding: | \$1,315,000 | \$1,327,535 | \$0 | \$1,327,535 | \$800,000 |

| Relative Benefits | Range | |
|---|-------|--------------|
| | Score | Score - C.M. |
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | NA | NA |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | 14 | 2 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | 11 | 0 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | NA | NA |
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | NA | NA |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|------|---|
| Number of Benefits | 2 | Sub-total Score | 25 | 2 |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | | 12.5 | 1 |
| Highest Benefit Score | | | 14 | 2 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. | | 4 | 1 |
| Score: | | | |
| 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. | | | |
| 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. | | | |
| 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. | | | |
| Confidence measure (C.M.): | | | |
| 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. | | | |
| 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. | | | |
| 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | | | |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 16.5 | 2 |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 18 | 3 |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|--|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. | | | x |
| Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): | | | |
| IT budget request \$ 1327535 General funds .774 % 1,027,535 \$ | | | |
| Other project costs \$ General funds % \$ | | | |
| Total project cost \$ 1327535 General funds .774 % 1,027,535 \$ | | | |
| B. Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. | | | x |
| Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): | | | |
| Change in operating cost \$ 20,000 General funds 100% 20,000 \$ | | | |
| Total 5 year cost impact | 1,427,535 | | |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | 14.27 | | |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | 1,127,535 | | |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | 11.27 | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | | Score |
|--|--|--------------|
| Score all risks from the following list. A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors. | | |
| A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project. Score: 4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified. 2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified. 0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named. | | 5 |
| B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk). Score: 4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology. 2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future. 0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized. | | 4 |
| C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk. Score: 4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months. 2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months. 0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete. | | 3 |
| D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk. Score: 4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services. 2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified. 0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified. | | 3 |
| Total Score | | 15 |

IT Plan – IT Plan - Submit

112 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: P-001 Longitudinal Data System

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 32 of 34

Agency Priority - 20 Project Type: New Initiative

Project description

This project will create follow-up information on education and training for organizations involved in education, workforce training, advising, job placement, and policy making; this project will also reduce replication and duplication presently involved in obtaining follow-up data collection. It will also provide an economic development tool which documents the effectiveness of education and training programs in ND for use by businesses, communities, and economic development organizations.

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

To realize the goals of the P-16 as well as those of economic and workforce development, the state needs data systems that provide ready access to the high-quality information decision-makers need. Educators and policymakers are recognizing the need for a longitudinal system that will allow P-16 officials to track outcomes from high school through higher education and into the workforce. This requires a robust system to collect data from multiple sources while protecting confidential data.

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

The Longitudinal Data System Committee (LDS) will propose, develop and govern a system for sharing longitudinal data that will maximize the usefulness of management information to stakeholders and partners of North Dakota education, training, employment and service systems while protecting the privacy and security of personal information. Current plans are for this multi-agency effort to be housed in ITD's budget.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

- Enhance the quality of data and data querying so better decisions can be made in meeting workforce development needs.
- Help state and state agencies allocate money and resources to actual needs and trends in the employment and educational sectors.
- Provide follow-up information on education and training for organizations involved in education, workforce training, advising, job placement, and policy making;

More benefits can be found in the full business case

Describe the impact of not implementing the project.

The business needs of P-16 officials and economic and workforce stakeholders will not be able to move forward in a coordinated fashion.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

Coordination needed for inter-agency cooperation is not realized – the risk is that the State LDS system ends up being less than a State LDS and instead become particularized to certain agencies or under utilized by enough agencies.

RISK MITIGATION: Ensure that there is a project manager as well as a business lead working with various state agencies and creating an open and clear channel and process of communication and cooperation.

IT Plan - IT Plan - Submit

I12 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: P-001 Longitudinal Data System

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 33 of 34

Describe the additional costs?

None

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?

Additional Costs? -

\$0

Optional Project Costs -

\$0

Total Project Cost? -

\$9,992,800

Tot Proj Costs + Optionals -

\$9,992,800

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?

None

IT Plan – IT Plan - Submit

112 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Version: 2009-A-12-00112

Project: P-001 Longitudinal Data System

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:21 AM

Page 34 of 34

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNium |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| IT5111 ADDITIONAL SALARIES | \$0 | \$0 | \$702,000 | \$702,000 | \$702,000 |
| IT5310 IT SOFTWARE AND SUPPLIES | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,200,000 | \$2,200,000 | \$880,000 |
| IT6010 IT DATA PROCESSING | \$0 | \$0 | \$702,000 | \$702,000 | \$280,000 |
| IT6030 IT CONTRACT SERVICES & REPAIRS | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,388,800 | \$5,388,800 | \$1,000,000 |
| IT6930 IT EQUIPMENT OVER \$5000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$500,000 |
| Total Budget: | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,992,800 | \$9,992,800 | \$3,362,000 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,992,800 | \$9,992,800 | \$3,362,000 |
| Total Funding: | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,992,800 | \$9,992,800 | \$3,362,000 |

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|--|--|-------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| <p>A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment.</p> <p>Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years.</p> <p>Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses.</p> | | | |
| <p>B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers.</p> <p>Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years.</p> <p>Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated.</p> | | 10 | 3 |
| <p>C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings.</p> <p>Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years.</p> <p>Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated.</p> | | 10 | 3 |
| <p>D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance.</p> <p>Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years.</p> <p>Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear.</p> | | 10 | 3 |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|---|
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. | | | |
| Score: | | | |
| 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. | | | |
| 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. | | | |
| 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. | | | |
| Confidence measure: | | | |
| 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. | | | |
| 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. | | | |
| 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | | | |
| Number of Benefits | | Sub-total Score | |
| | | 30 | 9 |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | 10 | 3 |
| Highest Benefit Score | | 10 | 3 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|--------------|---------------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. | | 5 | 0 |
| Score: | | | |
| 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. | | | |
| 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. | | | |
| 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. | | | |
| Confidence measure (C.M.): | | | |
| 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. | | | |
| 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. | | | |
| 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | | | |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 15 | 3 |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 15 | 3 |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|---|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. | | 6,085,270 | 6815,555 |
| Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): | | | |
| IT budget request \$ 6,085,270 General funds 100% 6,085,270 \$ | | | |
| Other project costs \$ General funds 100% \$ | | | |
| Total project cost \$ General funds 100% \$ | | | |
| B. Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. | | 1,137,030 | 1,250,733 |
| Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): | | | |
| Change in operating cost \$ 1,137,030 General funds 100% \$1,137,030 | | | |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | 11,770,420 | 13,069,220 |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | 117.7 | 130.6 |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | 11,770,420 | 13,069,220 |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | 117.7 | 130.6 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | Score |
|---|-----------|
| <p>Score all risks from the following list.</p> <p>A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors.</p> | |
| <p>A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified.</p> <p>2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named.</p> | 5 |
| <p>B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk).</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology.</p> <p>2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized.</p> | 4 |
| <p>C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months.</p> <p>2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months.</p> <p>0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete.</p> | 3 |
| <p>D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services.</p> <p>2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified.</p> | 3 |
| Total Score | 15 |

IT Plan – Agency Version Work Copy

127 OFFICE OF STATE TAX COMMISSIONER

Version: 2009-A-02-00127

Project: Oil&Gas Oil & Gas Gentax Integration

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:36 AM

Page 7 of 12

Agency Priority - 1

Project Type: Application replacement

Age of Current Application: 8

Project description

This project will include the modification of existing components and configuring new components required within the GenTax system to integrate the Oil and Gas tax returns. When completed, the Gentax system will replace the current Oil & Gas tax system that is currently managed by ITD. The Oil & Gas system manages tax returns which proved the state revenue of just over \$188 million over the last year.

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

The current system is one of the last silo tax systems within the Tax Department. This system was developed by ITD in 1999 using Power Builder. Since PowerBuilder is not an Enterprise Architecture approved standard for software development, ITD is no longer doing development in Power Builder and their resources for maintaining the system are quickly diminishing.

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

When completed, all areas of the Oil & Gas tax will be administered using the Gentax system. Currently only the Accounts Receivable component of this tax is administered using Gentax with a complicated interface back to the existing Power Builder system to process returns, payments and refunds.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

Modifications to the new system will be timelier because changes to the system will be made in-house by existing Tax Department IT staff

The Oil and Gas returns will be one of many tax types administered using the Gentax system. This consistency across tax types enables Tax Department IT staff to generate reports, make EOY changes, and modify the configuration to make enhancements to the Oil and Gas tax type just as they do for all other tax types.

Describe the impact of not implementing the project.

If the project is not implemented, the Tax Department will continue to administer this tax type using the existing PowerBuilder based system. ITD will continue to support the current system with no guarantee of quality of the PowerBuilder resources available.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

Administering the Oil and Gas Tax returns, payments and refunds within GenTax will be quite different than it is using the existing system. Extensive training for all staff members will be required to make a smooth transition.

- ☐ Oil & Gas staff will be involved throughout the configuration and conversion of this project. In addition to attending meetings to gather information and provide input to ensure the proper configuration, staff will be required to test all components throughout the process prior to the actual conversion of data from Power Builder to GenTax. Availability of staff will be an important factor to complete this project on time.

IT Plan – Agency Version Work Copy

127 OFFICE OF STATE TAX COMMISSIONER

Version: 2009-A-02-00127

Project: Oil&Gas Oil & Gas Gentax Integration

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:36 AM

Page 8 of 12

Describe the additional costs?

The additional costs are staff costs based on ITD's "ESTIMATING AND REPORTING REALLOCATED STAFF COSTS" spreadsheet.

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?
Additional Costs? - \$225,000

Optional Project Costs - \$0

Total Project Cost? -

Tot Proj Costs + Optionals - \$1,725,000
\$1,725,000

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?

None

Explanation of Financial Impact.

There will be no financial impact for this project as the existing Gentax maintenance we are scheduled to pay will not increase when this project is completed. Existing Tax IT staff and on-site Fast support will maintain the module as needed. There will be no additional data storage needed.

IT Plan – Agency Version Work Copy

127 OFFICE OF STATE TAX COMMISSIONER

Version: 2009-A-02-00127

Project: Oil&Gas Oil & Gas Gentax Integration

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:36 AM

Page 9 of 12

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNIAL |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| IT6030 IT CONTRACT SERVICES & REPAIRS | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,500,000 | \$1,500,000 | \$0 |
| Total Budget: | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,500,000 | \$1,500,000 | \$0 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,500,000 | \$1,500,000 | \$0 |
| Total Funding: | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,500,000 | \$1,500,000 | \$0 |

Ranking Large IT Projects – 2009-11

AGENCY: Office of State Tax Commissioner

PROJECT: Oil and Gas

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | | 4 | 7 |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 5 | 7 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 15 | 2 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 15 | 0 |

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|----|
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. | | 15 | 0 |
| Score: | | | |
| 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. | | | |
| 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. | | | |
| 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. | | | |
| Confidence measure: | | | |
| 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. | | | |
| 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. | | | |
| 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | | | |
| Number of Benefits 5 | | Sub-total Score 54 | 16 |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | 10.8 | 4 |
| Highest Benefit Score | | 15 | 7 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|--------------|---------------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. | | NA | |
| Score: | | | |
| 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. | | | |
| 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. | | | |
| 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. | | | |
| Confidence measure (C.M.): | | | |
| 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. | | | |
| 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. | | | |
| 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | | | |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|---|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. | | 1.5M | 1.5M |
| Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): | | | |
| IT budget request \$ 1,500,000 General funds 100 % 1,500,000 \$ | | | |
| Other project costs \$ General funds % \$ | | | |
| Total project cost \$ 1,500,000 General funds 100 % 1,500,000 \$ | | | |
| B. Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. | | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): | | | |
| Change in operating cost \$ 0.00 General funds % 0.00 \$ | | | |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | 1500000 | 1500000 |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | 15 | 15 |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | 1500000 | 1500000 |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | 15 | 15 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | Score |
|---|-------|
| <p>Score all risks from the following list. A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors.</p> | |
| <p>A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified.</p> <p>2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named.</p> | 4 |
| <p>B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk).</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology.</p> <p>2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized.</p> | 5 |
| <p>C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months.</p> <p>2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months.</p> <p>0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete.</p> | 5 |
| <p>D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services.</p> <p>2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified.</p> | 5 |
| Total Score | 19 |

IT Plan – Agency Version Work Copy

127 OFFICE OF STATE TAX COMMISSIONER

Version: 2009-A-02-00127

Project: TAP/FTT TaxPayer Access Program/Financial Institution Tax

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:36 AM

Page 10 of 12

Agency Priority - 1

Project Type: New initiative

Age of Current Application: 7

Project description

Taxpayer Access Program (TAP) is a module within Gentax which provides secure taxpayer self-service functions via the Internet. Taxpayers can view account status, inspect filing and payment history, and file and pay online.

TAP also has the ability to provide a web presence to allow taxpayers to enter a specific tax type return directly into Gentax after validation. This capability within TAP would replace the current Financial Institution Tax (FIT) front end system.

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

Currently Gentax is used only for accounts receivable for FIT, and we maintain a separate system to collect and manage FIT returns. The existing FIT system is a standalone system which was developed by an external company that no longer supports the system. Legislative changes required to this system are quite cumbersome and sometimes impossible to accomplish because of the complexity and unique way it was developed.

The current FIT system also has a history of losing returns or corrupting the data on the returns. The only way to correct the problem is to have the returns resubmitted causing frustration for the financial institutions.

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

Our Vision statement reads "The vision of the Office of State Tax Commissioner is to instill the highest degree of public confidence in our integrity and reliability by providing prompt, accurate and courteous service while promoting compliance with the tax laws of North Dakota".

TAP will greatly improve our ability to provide prompt and accurate information to the taxpayers in ND. It also enables taxpayers to pay taxes online for all tax accounts related to that taxpayer. Replacing the current FIT system will improve our reliability and accuracy to administer FIT.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

TAP will allow taxpayers to view the status of their refunds, allow businesses to file change of address notices, review returns from past years and make payments for taxes due.

The additional information available on the Internet will provide prompt and accurate information for FIT customers in a timelier manner. Phone calls should be reduced allowing for more time for staff to provide courteous service promoting compliance of the FIT laws of North Dakota.

The replacement of the FIT system also will provide a more reliable and manageable environment for the financial institutions to submit their returns and remit

IT Plan – Agency Version Work Copy

127 OFFICE OF STATE TAX COMMISSIONER

Version: 2009-A-02-00127

Project: TAP/FTT TaxPayer Access Program/Financial Institution Tax

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:36 AM

Page 11 of 12

the tax due.

Describe the impact of not implementing the project.

The FIT tax returns will continue to be processed using the current, unstable, standalone system. The problems associated with FIT will continue unless we hire a vendor to rewrite the front end collection of FIT returns and then integrate the collected tax return into GenTax.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

There are no risks; the risk is in not implementing this project. GenTax is the tool used to administer most tax types for the past two years. Any modifications made to the system to implement additional tax types undergo extensive testing before migrating them to NDP.

Describe the additional costs?

The additional costs are staff costs based on ITD's "ESTIMATING AND REPORTING REALLOCATED STAFF COSTS" spreadsheet.

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen? | \$187,500 |
| Additional Costs? - | |
| Optional Project Costs - | \$0 |
| Total Project Cost? - | \$1,437,500 |
| Total Proj Costs + Optionals - | \$1,437,500 |

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?

None

Explanation of Financial Impact.

To deploy this application and have it hosted by ITD, it will cost \$19,200 per binnium. If we deploy the Taxpayer Access program and also deploy a new Financial Institution Tax program using TAP, it will cost approximately \$400 per month per application for these applications to be hosted by ITD.

There will be no other financial impact for this project as the existing Gentax maintenance we are scheduled to pay will not increase when we add the TAP into the GENTAX system. Existing Tax IT staff and on-site Fast support will maintain the module as needed. There will be no additional data storage needed as we currently store Financial Institution Tax returns in SQL databases. These databases will be converted into the Gentax databases.

IT Plan – Agency Version Work Copy

127 OFFICE OF STATE TAX COMMISSIONER

Version: 2009-A-02-00127

Project: TAP/FTT TaxPayer Access Program/Financial Institution Tax

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:36 AM

Page 12 of 12

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNIAL |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| IT6030 IT CONTRACT SERVICES & REPAIRS | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,250,000 | \$1,250,000 | \$0 |
| Total Budget: | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,250,000 | \$1,250,000 | \$0 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,250,000 | \$1,250,000 | \$0 |
| Total Funding: | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,250,000 | \$1,250,000 | \$0 |

Ranking Large IT Projects – 2009-11

AGENCY: Office of State Tax Commissioner

PROJECT: Taxpayer Access Program (TAP)
Financial Institution Tax (FIT)

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | | 5 | 6 |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 15 | 3 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 15 | 2 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 15 | 0 |

| | | | |
|--|---|----|------|
| E. | Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | 15 | 0 |
| Number of Benefits 5 Sub-total Score | | 65 | 11 |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | 13 | 2.75 |
| Highest Benefit Score | | 15 | 6 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|--|---|--------------|---------------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. | Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. Score: 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | NA | |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|--|---|--------------------|----------------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. | Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): IT budget request \$ 1,250,000 General funds 100 % 1,250,000 \$ Other project costs \$ General funds % \$ Total project cost \$ 1,250,000 General funds 100 % 1,250,000 \$ | 1.25M | 1.25M |
| B. | Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): Change in operating cost \$ 9,600 General funds 100 % \$9,600\$ | 9600 | 12000 |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | 1298000 | 1310000 |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | 12.98 | 13.1 |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | 1298000 | 1310000 |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | 12.98 | 13.1 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | Score |
|---|-------|
| <p>Score all risks from the following list.</p> <p>A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors.</p> | |
| <p>A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified.</p> <p>2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named.</p> | 4 |
| <p>B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk).</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology.</p> <p>2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized.</p> | 5 |
| <p>C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months.</p> <p>2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months.</p> <p>0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete.</p> | 5 |
| <p>D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services.</p> <p>2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified.</p> | 5 |
| Total Score | 19 |

IT Plan – Agency Version

325 DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

Version: 2009-A-01-00325

Project: 1 Replace Eligibility Determination System(s)

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:43 AM

Page 9 of 14

Agency Priority - 1 Project Type: Application replacement Age of Current Application: 25

Project description

See attached Narrative.

In 1984, TECS (Technical Eligibility Computer System), a mainframe eligibility system, was transferred from Alaska and enhanced by North Dakota to determine eligibility for the Food Stamp program and AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) program for the ND Department of Human Services. Since that time, the Department of Human Services has continued to enhance the eligibility determination functions to include:

- ☐ Medicaid program, including Medicare Buy – In
- ☐ Prospective budgeting for the Food Stamp Program
- ☐ Spousal Impoverishment, Pregnant Woman and Offset of Recipient Liability for the Medicaid Program
- ☐ Primary Care Provider requirement for some coverage for the Medicaid Program
- ☐ (QMB) Qualified Medicare Beneficiaries for the Medicaid Program

In 1996, TEEM (Training, Employment, Education and Management) system was developed with Client/Server Knowledge Based Rules technology to process Case Assessment Screenings for the AFDC cases in the TECS system.

Over the next few years, TEEM was enhanced to determine eligibility for:

- ☐ AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) Program, now known as TANF (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families)
- ☐ TANF Benefit Cap,

In 2001, TEEM system name was changed to Vision, the name was no longer appropriate as the system was enhanced to determine eligibility for Children and Family Medicaid cases and also Medicaid eligibility was also de-linked from TANF eligibility. Continued eligibility enhancements include:

- ☐ Aged, Blind and Disabled for Children and Families Medicaid coverage
- ☐ Worker's with Disabilities and other Aged and Disabled Medicaid coverage
- ☐ Healthy Steps (State Children's Health Insurance Program).

In 1996, ASSIST (Achieving Support System Integration through Services and Technology) system was developed along side of the TEEM application with Client/Server Knowledge Based Rules Technology to manage service eligibility, case management and care coordination functions for Development Disability Services business needs.

Built in 1980 and running in a mainframe, COBAL and Natural environment, LIHEAP (Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program) is used to provide home energy assistance to eligible low income households

IT Plan -- Agency Version

325 DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

Version: 2009-A-01-00325

Project: 1 Replace Eligibility Determination System(s)

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:43 AM

Page 10 of 14

The scope of the project is a development effort which consists of two focuses :

Technical focus:

- ☐ Transform and modernize the applications which are under an AllFusion Gen architecture (previously known to as COOLGEN, and noted above as "Client/Server Knowledge Based Technology") into a service oriented environment enabling the access and delivery via a web client
 - o VISION application
 - o ASSIST application
- ☐ Integrate the eligibility functions of the various applications into one seamless User Centric application, including all needed interfaces.
- ☐ Leverage the technologies now being utilized by the Department to maximize application efficiency and service delivery
 - o Replacement of document management tool
 - o Integration into Master Client Index

Business focus:

- ☐ Provide web enabled user centric applications
- ☐ Add functionality which will provide a tool to destroy electronic records in accordance to State and Federal records laws and requirements.
- ☐ North Dakota Century Code 54-46 Records Management
- ☐ Electronic Records Management Guidelines
- ☐ Human Service Centers Record Retention Schedule with Descriptions
- ☐ Federal Rules of Evidence

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

See attached Narrative.

- ☐ Business critical applications, VISION and ASSIST are using AllFusion Gen Client/Server architecture, which is outdated and in danger of not being supported by the vendor, Computer Associates.
- ☐ The county eligibility workers would like one system to contain all of the eligibility determination functions. Currently eligibility workers are required to use multiple systems to complete the eligibility workflow.
- ☐ The VISION application ITD costs are nearing 5 million dollars a biennium for mainframe cpu and batch processing. All indications are that these mainframe costs will continue to increase. It is cost prohibitive to continue to run VISION on the mainframe.
- ☐ DHS staff and specifically DHS partners have become vocal regarding the inflexibility and outdated technology of the ASSIST application. ASSIST stakeholders have expressed the desire and need to access the ASSIST application via a web client.

IT Plan – Agency Version

325 DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

Version: 2009-A-01-00325

Project: 1 Replace Eligibility Determination System(s)

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:43 AM

Page 11 of 14

- ☐ Currently, the ASSIST Program does not have the ability to purge/delete the electronic client information it creates and stores. This is a legal liability for the Department and a non-compliance issue related to retention schedule guidelines
- ☐ DHS is limited in its ability to share information regarding clients interactively amongst its service programs resulting in a lack of efficient and effective reporting for decision making.
- ☐ DHS experiences challenges in the effort to generate unduplicated counts of client interactions with various services which impacts the quality, timeliness and efficiencies in responding to requests for such information.

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

The North Dakota Department of Human Services' mission is to provide quality, efficient and effective human services, which improve the lives of people. Leveraging the investment in the legacy systems through re-architecting into a modern platform will result in improved maintainability, reduced costs and increased usability, productivity and responsiveness of the IT organization to the business; the appropriate and consistent management of electronic records.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

See attached Narrative.

- ☐ The use of this transformation solution is estimated to achieve a 50% reduction in effort and cost via the use of application tools, templates and frameworks during the transformation process.
- ☐ Leverage of technology assets for similar application functions as a result of published web services
- ☐ Significant increase in end user productivity, product usability and user satisfaction
- ☐ System operational costs will be decreased.
- ☐ Proactive records management processes can reduce litigation defense costs with regard to electronic discovery
- ☐ Ability for a horizontal view of clients served by DHS resulting in better decision making.
- ☐ Improved accuracy in unduplicated client related reports.
- ☐ Increased efficiencies in analysis which will allow HSC to effectively analyze trends and provide insight to improve the Department's overall client services.

Describe the impact of not implementing the project.

See attached Narrative.

IT Plan – Agency Version

325 DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

Version: 2009-A-01-00325

Project: 1 Replace Eligibility Determination System(s)

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:43 AM

Page 12 of 14

- ☐ The current VISION and ASSIST applications would remain outdated and in danger of not being supported by Computer Associates.
- ☐ The county eligibility would continue using multiple systems for Medicaid, TANF, Child Care, LIHEAP and Food Stamps.
- ☐ We would see our computer charges continue to increase each biennium. We are projecting almost 5 million in CPU charges for the 2007-2009 Biennium in Vision alone.
- ☐ Absence of an effectively managed records program increases the Department's risk for non-compliance with State and Federal records laws and requirements and increases the risk of costly litigation (E-discovery).
- ☐ Challenges related to accuracy, efficiency of the counting, reporting and publishing of clients across services will continue.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.
See attached Narrative.

- ☐ The ASSIST application is too closely integrated with the VISION application and therefore unable to separate code and successfully complete transformation of architecture.
- ☐ Functionality is lost during code transformation
- ☐ The transformation requirements, time and effort were not understood resulting in significant under-estimation of the vendor transformation costs
- ☐ Over allocation of program staff resources affecting the quality and timeliness of service delivery
- ☐ Child Support costs would increase since they would be the largest application left on the mainframe.

Describe the additional costs?

DHS staff time. This does not represent new FTEs.

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Additional Costs? - | \$1,045,200 |
| Optional Project Costs - | \$0 |
| Total Project Cost? - | \$19,542,200 |
| Tot Proj Costs + Optionals - | \$19,542,200 |

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?

N/A

Explanation of Financial Impact.

We kept the ongoing operations equal to our current operations, therefore there is no operational change in subsequent bienniums identified in the IT project budget.

IT Plan – Agency Version**325 DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES****Version: 2009-A-01-00325****Project: 1 Replace Eligibility Determination System(s)**

Date: 8/4/2008**Time: 8:43 AM****Page 13 of 14**

IT Plan -- Agency Version

325 DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

Version: 2009-A-01-00325

Project: 1 Replace Eligibility Determination System(s)

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 8:43 AM

Page 14 of 14

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNIMUM |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| IT6010 IT DATA PROCESSING | \$0 | \$0 | \$18,500,000 | \$18,500,000 | \$8,600,000 |
| Total Budget: | \$0 | \$0 | \$18,500,000 | \$18,500,000 | \$8,600,000 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,250,000 | \$9,250,000 | \$4,300,000 |
| 002 FEDERAL FUND BUDGET | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,250,000 | \$9,250,000 | \$4,300,000 |
| Total Funding: | \$0 | \$0 | \$18,500,000 | \$18,500,000 | \$8,600,000 |

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | | 2 | 3 |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 13 | 1 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 15 | 0 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 5 | 0 |
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 15 | 0 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|----|
| Number of Benefits | 5 | Sub-total Score | 50 |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | | 10 |
| Highest Benefit Score | | | 15 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. | | N/A | |
| Score: | | | |
| 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. | | | |
| 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. | | | |
| 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. | | | |
| Confidence measure (C.M.): | | | |
| 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. | | | |
| 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. | | | |
| 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | | | |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | N/A |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | 15 |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|--|--|-------------|---------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. | | 18.5M | |
| Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): | | | |
| IT budget request \$ 18,500,000 General funds % 50 \$ 9,250,000 | | | |
| Other project costs \$ 1,110,000 General funds % These are staff costs (soft costs) at various general fund match percentages | | | |
| Total project cost \$ 19,610,000 General funds % \$ | | | |
| B. Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. | | (2M) | |
| Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): | | | |
| Change in operating cost \$ (2,000,000) General funds 50 % (\$ 1,000,000) this represents a reduction in operating costs | | | |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | (10M) | |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | (100) | |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | (5M) | |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | (50) | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | Score |
|---|-------|
| <p>Score all risks from the following list.</p> <p>A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors.</p> | |
| <p>A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified.</p> <p>2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named.</p> | 5 |
| <p>B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk).</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology.</p> <p>2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized.</p> | 5 |
| <p>C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months.</p> <p>2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months.</p> <p>0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete.</p> | 1 |
| <p>D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services.</p> <p>2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified.</p> | 2 |
| Total Score | 13 |

IT Plan – Agency Version

530 DEPT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHAB

Version: 2009-A-01-00530

Project: DOC200 INTEGRATE FIELD SERVICE OPERATIONS INTO ITAG

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:06 AM

Page 10 of 13

Agency Priority - 1

Project Type: New initiative

Project description

Integrate the Docstars offender management system (parole and probation) with the Itag offender management system (prison facilities).

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

As noted in the State Auditor's information system audit of the Docstars offender management system, there is a lack of integration between the information systems used in parole and probation (Docstars) and the prison facilities (Itag). Limited data sharing between the two systems is accomplished via a nightly data dump.

For a small system with limited resources, North Dakota has a remarkably advanced system of information management. The ITAG system, the Department's core

Security Response Technologies, Inc.

- 52 -

application, is as sophisticated as any correctional information system currently in use and meets the Department's needs very well. The one major deficiency noted was a need to link communication of information between the institutional system, ITAG, and the Field Services system, DOCSTARS. This would allow for much more efficient sharing of information and processing of offenders to community programs. Given the limited structure of the DOCSTARS system, the Department should make plans to acquire a comprehensive information management system for Field Services that is fully compatible and can share data with the ITAG system.

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

By integrating the Docstars system with the Itag system, inmate / offender management would be done on one information system regardless of community or institutional placement.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

Single source for input of offender information for the agency, decreasing the risk or errors occurring in data entry.

Significantly increase the technical capabilities of Field Services offender management. Provide the core foundation for both current and future operational requirements.

IT Plan – Agency Version

530 DEPT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHAB

Version: 2009-A-01-00530

Project: DOC200 INTEGRATE FIELD SERVICE OPERATIONS INTO ITAG

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:06 AM

Page 11 of 13

Describe the impact of not implementing the project.

Increased risk of errors occurring in occurring due to the inefficiencies that result from entering the same data twice into two information systems. The agency is planning to revise the Docstars system to integrate more with the Itag system using in-house I.T. resources. Parole and probation operations will continue to run as normal with little impact. Eventually Docstars will reach the end of its operational lifespan, but should continue to operate effectively for another 5 to 7 years.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

No formal cost / benefit analysis or study has been completed to arrive at the anticipated benefits of a integrated offender management system for the agency. Risks are unknown at this time and are dependant on existing technology offerings. Operational costs depend on the amount of dynamic (unplanned) customization that is often required for community correctional systems. These systems need to support new law enforcement requirements or changes to the supervision model brought about by legislative or political capitalization. Changes to a unified system depending on the scope of change could incur significant costs. Customization costs can be as little as \$2000 to hundreds of thousands of dollars. Estimated license and usage costs per biennium to run a unified community corrections system would be projected at an additional \$75,000. Once the agency moves to a central unified system funding must be available to insure its ongoing operation.

Describe the additional costs?

The unknown costs of converting Docstars data into the Itag system. The financial impact of re-designing interfaces that use the Docstars system. The costs of converting NCIC offense records to ND century code offense types. Analysis of the impact of change that would occur to DOCR operations using a unified offender management system.

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?

Additional Costs? -

\$750,000

Optional Project Costs -

Total Project Cost? -

\$3,000,000

Tot Proj Costs + Optionals -

\$3,000,000

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?

n/a

Explanation of Financial Impact.

Other than the cost of implementation, the integration of the Docstars and Itag systems would not have a direct financial impact, as the purpose of the integration is not to facilitate

IT Plan – Agency Version

Date: 8/4/2008

530 DEPT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHAB

Time: 9:06 AM

Version: 2009-A-01-00530

Page 12 of 13

Project: DOC200 INTEGRATE FIELD SERVICE OPERATIONS INTO ITAG

the generation of income or the collection of fees. The estimated costs of the integration is \$3.75 million for the first stage. If and when further integration is pursued, second stage enhancement could approach \$1.5 million in 11-13 biennium.

IT Plan – Agency Version

530 DEPT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHAB

Version: 2009-A-01-00530

Project: DOC200 INTEGRATE FIELD SERVICE OPERATIONS INTO ITAG

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:06 AM

Page 13 of 13

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNIAL |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| IT6030 IT CONTRACT SERVICES & REPAIRS | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,750,000 | \$3,750,000 | \$1,550,000 |
| Total Budget: | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,750,000 | \$3,750,000 | \$1,550,000 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,750,000 | \$3,750,000 | \$1,550,000 |
| Total Funding: | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,750,000 | \$3,750,000 | \$1,550,000 |

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | | 2 | 8 |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 2 | 8 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 6 | 8 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 5 | 0 |
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 5 | 8 |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|----|----|
| Number of Benefits | 5 | Sub-total Score | 20 | 32 |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | | 4 | 8 |
| Highest Benefit Score | | | 6 | 8 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|---|---|-------|--------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. NA | | | Score - C.M. |
| F. | Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. Score: 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | | |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|--|---|-------------|---------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. | Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): IT budget request \$ 3M General funds 100% 3M \$ Other project costs \$ General funds % \$ Total project cost \$ General funds % \$ | 3M | 3.5M |
| B. | Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): Change in operating cost \$ 54,000 General funds 100 % \$ | 81K | 85K |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | 405K | 410K |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | 4.05 | 4.1 |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | 405K | 410K |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | 4.05 | 4.10 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | Score |
|---|-----------|
| <p>Score all risks from the following list.</p> <p>A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors.</p> | |
| <p>A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified.</p> <p>2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named.</p> | 5 |
| <p>B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk).</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology.</p> <p>2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized.</p> | 5 |
| <p>C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months.</p> <p>2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months.</p> <p>0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete.</p> | 5 |
| <p>D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services.</p> <p>2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified.</p> | 1 |
| Total Score | 16 |

IT Plan – Agency Version

540 ADJUTANT GENERAL

Version: 2009-A-01-00540

Project: INF001 State-wide Seamless Base Map

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:16 AM

Page 12 of 38

Agency Priority - 1 Project Type: New initiative

Project description

Obtain a statewide seamless, spatially accurate, and complete base map dataset that is accessible by all state agencies, local and tribal governments, and the general public.

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

The State of North Dakota, local and tribal government, and the private sector need a seamless, base map data set that is spatially accurate and containing the necessary attributes to be used by multiple applications and users. In particular, such a dataset is needed for emergency services and daily state agency activities. This mapping project directly ties to dispatch mapping, computer aided dispatch (CAD) and automatic vehicle location (AVL).

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

Improve the interoperability and redundancy of dispatch centers by integrating the statewide base map dataset into all dispatching systems including mapping software, computer aided dispatch and future automated vehicle location technology.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

State mapping will provide significant benefits throughout both local and state government as well as the general public and private industry. Please see attached narrative.

1. Emergency Services & Public Safety
 - ☐ Fastest and safest route to the scene
 - ☐ Responders working within their jurisdiction or in support of others
 - ☐ Foundation for all response and public safety organization who document critical safety information
2. General Public
 - ☐ Use of commercialized GIS products such as car navigation systems and Google Earth
 - ☐ Tourism, hunting, fishing
 - ☐ Enhanced public safety
3. State Government
 - ☐ Sales tax collection
 - ☐ Base map for nearly all mapping activities
 - ☐ Human and animal disease control and tracking
 - ☐ Mapping of sex offenders
4. Local Government
 - ☐ Sales and land valuation tax collection
 - ☐ Multi-county response to emergencies and other public safety
 - ☐ Management of land use, facilities, infrastructure

IT Plan – Agency Version

540 ADJUTANT GENERAL

Version: 2009-A-01-00540

Project: INF001 State-wide Seamless Base Map

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:16 AM

Page 13 of 38

5. Private Industry

- ☐ Economic development
- ☐ Access to oil & gas fields
- ☐ Siting for pipeline, electric transmission, and wind power
- ☐ Implementation of public safety systems

Describe the impact of not implementing the project.

An accurate base map is key piece to all dispatch centers being interoperable. The current mapping system State Radio uses has accuracy problems and dated information.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

State Radio will continue to utilize a map with less accuracy and dated information and this has an effect on public safety.

Describe the additional costs?

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?

Additional Costs? -

Optional Project Costs -

Total Project Cost? -

Tot Proj Costs + Optionals -

\$0

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?

N/A

Explanation of Financial Impact.

The projected costs of maintaining the mapping is \$10,000 per year or \$20,000 per biennium.

IT Plan – Agency Version**540 ADJUTANT GENERAL**

Version: 2009-A-01-00540

Project: INF001 State-wide Seamless Base Map

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:15 AM

Page 14 of 38

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNium |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| IT6030 IT CONTRACT SERVICES & REPAIRS | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 |
| IT6930 IT EQUIPMENT OVER \$5000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,100,000 | \$2,100,000 | \$0 |
| Total Budget: | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,100,000 | \$2,100,000 | \$20,000 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,100,000 | \$2,100,000 | \$20,000 |
| Total Funding: | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,100,000 | \$2,100,000 | \$20,000 |

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | | 12 | 3 |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 10 | 1 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 11 | 1 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 12 | 2 |
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 13 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|------|-----|
| Number of Benefits | 5 | Sub-total Score | 58 | 8 |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | | 11.6 | 1.6 |
| Highest Benefit Score | | | 13 | 1 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|--|---|-------|--------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. | Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. Score: 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | 3 | 1 |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 14.6 | 2.6 |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 16 | 2 |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|--|---|-------------|---------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. | Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): IT budget request \$ 8,000,000 General funds 100 % \$8,000,000 Other project costs \$0 General funds 0 % \$ 0 Total project cost \$ 8,000,000 General funds 100 % \$8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | 8,100,000 |
| B. | Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): Change in operating cost \$163,200 General funds 20% \$163,200 | 163,200 | 200,000 |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | 8,816,000 | 9,100,000 |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | 88.16 | 91.0 |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | 8,816,000 | 9,100,000 |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | 88.16 | 91.0 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | Score |
|--|-----------|
| <p>Score all risks from the following list. A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors.</p> | |
| <p>A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified.</p> <p>2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named.</p> | 5 |
| <p>B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk).</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology.</p> <p>2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. <i>Or</i> use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized.</p> | 5 |
| <p>C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months.</p> <p>2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months.</p> <p>0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. <i>Or</i> the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete.</p> | 3 |
| <p>D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services.</p> <p>2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified.</p> | 3 |
| Total Score | 16 |

IT Plan – Agency Version

540 ADJUTANT GENERAL

Version: 2009-A-01-00540

Project: INF002 Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Phase 2

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:15 AM

Page 15 of 38

Agency Priority - 2 Project Type: Ongoing initiative

Project description

The 2007 Legislature approved \$980,000 for a Computer Aided Dispatch system (CAD). The agency is currently getting ready to release an RFP for the project in August. This project request is to provide a phase 2 for the initial 2007 project. Please see attached narrative.

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

Make a fully interoperable system that can be used by or connected to other sheriff and police departments plus give enhanced services for FIRE and EMS.

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

Our goal is to provide an efficient public safety communications system to federal, state, and local agencies. We want systems that can be interoperable for all stakeholders.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

This will give the sheriff and city police departments the ability to utilize the CAD system or connect their existing CAD system to the state's system, giving the state tremendous interoperable capabilities.

A Phase 2 would provide an enhanced, more robust CAD system as follows:

1. Interoperability with other existing CAD systems within the state.
2. The ability for local sheriff and police departments to operate off a single system.
3. The ability for State Radio supported counties' FIRE and EMS to be dispatched from the system.
4. Continue adding more mapping components.
5. Add Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) to the system.

Describe the impact of not implementing the project.

The CAD system will only be able to perform basic CAD functions.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

An enhanced CAD would mitigate the risks identified in the base CAD business case.

Describe the additional costs?

All costs will be more accurately determined after the responses to the CAD RFP are analyzed.

IT Plan – Agency Version

540 ADJUTANT GENERAL

Version: 2009-A-01-00540

Project: INF002 Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Phase 2

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:15 AM

Page 16 of 38

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?

Additional Costs? -

Optional Project Costs -

Total Project Cost? -

Tot Proj Costs + Optionals -

\$0

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?

NA

Explanation of Financial Impact.

The agency is currently getting ready to release an RFP for the 2007 Legislatively approved project in August. This will provide accurate information for ongoing costs.

IT Plan – Agency Version**540 ADJUTANT GENERAL**

Version: 2009-A-01-00540

Project: INF002 Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Phase 2

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:15 AM

Page 17 of 38

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNIMUM |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| IT6930 IT EQUIPMENT OVER \$5000 | \$980,000 | \$0 | \$2,000,000 | \$2,000,000 | \$0 |
| Total Budget: | \$980,000 | \$0 | \$2,000,000 | \$2,000,000 | \$0 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$980,000 | \$0 | \$2,000,000 | \$2,000,000 | \$0 |
| Total Funding: | \$980,000 | \$0 | \$2,000,000 | \$2,000,000 | \$0 |

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | | 12 | 6 |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 13 | 1 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 12 | 3 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 5 | 6 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------|------------------------|
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. | | | 15 | 2 |
| Score: | | | | |
| 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. | | | | |
| 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. | | | | |
| 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. | | | | |
| Confidence measure: | | | | |
| 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. | | | | |
| 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. | | | | |
| 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | | | | |
| Number of Benefits | | | 5 | Sub-total Score |
| | | | 57 | 18 |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | | 11.4 | 3.6 |
| Highest Benefit Score | | | 15 | 1 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | | Range | |
|---|--|--|--------------|---------------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. | | | 5 | 1 |
| Score: | | | | |
| 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. | | | | |
| 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. | | | | |
| 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. | | | | |
| Confidence measure (C.M.): | | | | |
| 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. | | | | |
| 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. | | | | |
| 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | | | | |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | 16.4 | 4.6 |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | | 20 | 2 |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|---|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. | | 2,000,000 | 2,100,000 |
| Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): | | | |
| IT budget request \$2,000,000 General funds 100% \$2,000,000 | | | |
| Other project costs \$ _____ General funds _____ % _____ \$ | | | |
| Total project cost \$2,000,000 General funds 100% \$2,000,000 | | | |
| B. Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. | | | |
| Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): | | | |
| Change in operating cost \$ _____ General funds _____ % _____ \$ | | | |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | 2,000,000 | 2,100,000 |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | 20 | 21 |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | 2,000,000 | 2,100,000 |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | 20 | 21 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | Score |
|---|-----------|
| <p>Score all risks from the following list. A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors.</p> | |
| <p>A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified.</p> <p>2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named.</p> | 5 |
| <p>B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk).</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology.</p> <p>2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized.</p> | 5 |
| <p>C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months.</p> <p>2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months.</p> <p>0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete.</p> | 3 |
| <p>D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk.</p> <p>Score:</p> <p>4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services.</p> <p>2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified.</p> <p>0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified.</p> | 3 |
| Total Score | 16 |

IT Plan -- Agency Version

540 ADJUTANT GENERAL

Version: 2009-A-01-00540

Project: INF003 Additional State Radio Towers

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:15 AM

Page 18 of 38

Agency Priority - 3 Project Type: New initiative

Project description

Purchase and installation of 8 State Radio towers to be owned and operated by ND DOT.

Optional Package 1, Wales and Lisbon area, \$2,000,000

Optional Package 2, New Town, Marmarth and Mayville area, \$3,000,000

Optional Package 3, Bowbells, Towner, and Heart Butte area, \$3,000,000

Briefly describe the business need or problem driving the proposed project.

The current State Radio system has identified dead spots.

These dead spots need to be mitigated to give the state full interoperability plus officer safety and citizen protection.

Describe how the project is consistent with the organizations mission.

Our goal is to provide an efficient public safety communication system to federal, state, and local agencies. Maximum voice and data coverage minimizes risk to the users.

Describe the anticipated benefits of the project and who will derive the benefits.

The current radio network has dead spots that require additional tower sites to give the state maximum voice and data coverage. This project will benefit public safety officers and the citizens of North Dakota.

Describe the impact of not implementing the project

Continued dead spots create hazards to law enforcement and first responders being able to communicate in critical situations.

Identify any risks associated with implementing this project and explain how the risks will be mitigated.

Getting the maximum coverage for an area from the tower site. This will require engineering studies to help with location selections.

Describe the additional costs?

Property insurance costs for new towers for six months of the biennium.

Enter any additional costs for the project that are not included in IT Object Codes used in the Project Cost Screen?

Additional Costs? -

\$3,600

Optional Project Costs -

\$3,600

IT Plan – Agency Version

540 ADJUTANT GENERAL

Version: 2009-A-01-00540

Project: INF003 Additional State Radio Towers

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:15 AM

Page 19 of 38

Total Project Cost? -

\$0

Total Project Costs + Optionals -

\$3,600

What additional expenditures are being paid out of non-appropriated funds?
N/A

Explanation of Financial Impact

The estimated financial impact for eight new radio towers is \$326,400 per biennium beginning with the 11-13 biennium. IT Data Processing (T-1 line charges) at \$230,400 and IT Service Contracts at \$96,000 for a total of \$326,400.

IT Plan – Agency Version**540 ADJUTANT GENERAL**

Version: 2009-A-01-00540

Project: INF003 Additional State Radio Towers

Date: 8/4/2008

Time: 9:15 AM

Page 20 of 38

| | CURRENT APPROPRIATION | BUDGET REQUEST | OPTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS | REQUEST PLUS OPTIONALS | SUBSEQUENT BIENNIMUM |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| IT6010 IT DATA PROCESSING | \$0 | \$0 | \$57,600 | \$57,600 | \$230,400 |
| IT6030 IT CONTRACT SERVICES & REPAIRS | \$0 | \$0 | \$24,000 | \$24,000 | \$96,000 |
| IT6930 IT EQUIPMENT OVER \$5000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,000,000 | \$8,000,000 | \$0 |
| Total Budget: | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,081,600 | \$8,081,600 | \$326,400 |
| 001 STATE GENERAL FUND | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,081,600 | \$8,081,600 | \$326,400 |
| Total Funding: | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,081,600 | \$8,081,600 | \$326,400 |

| Relative Benefits | | Range | |
|---|--|-------|--------------|
| Score all benefits from the following list. If a benefit does not apply, indicate N/A. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| A. Return on Investment – Actual revenue increases, savings or cost reductions due to an investment. Score: 11-15 High financial benefit. Payback in 2 years or less. 6-10 Medium financial benefit. Payback in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little or no financial benefit. Payback greater than 5 years. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0-2 A thorough ROI analysis has been completed. Estimates have a high degree of reliability. 3-5 Estimated benefits are documented. Investment and ongoing costs are documented with some specificity. A comparison of costs and benefits has been completed. 6-8 Costs and benefits are estimated with little specificity. Estimates are educated guesses. | | 14 | 6 |
| B. Customer Service – Measurable improvements in service to customers. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit to a majority of the customer base within 2 years. 6-10 A medium benefit affecting a portion of the customer base will be realized within 2 years with a majority of the customer base impacted in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or small customer base impacted during the first 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Customer demand for the improvement has been documented. Measurable customer service benefits have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Customer service benefits have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 15 | 1 |
| C. Internal Efficiencies – Measurable improvements in internal operation that do not necessarily result in tangible cost savings. Score: 11-15 A significant benefit in terms of improved processing time, reallocation of staff time or other internal efficiency of high value based on the number of transactions, staff involved or other measure. Benefit will be fully realized in less than 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or value based on the scope of the change. Full benefit will be realized in 3 to 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or value based on the scope of the change or full benefit will not be realized for more than 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Measurable benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified and are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 3-5 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations have been identified without measures of success. The benefits are aligned with the organization's mission and goals. 6-8 Benefits due to improvements in internal operations are described with little specificity and may be unclear. Alignment with the organization's mission and goals has not been demonstrated. | | 12 | 1 |
| D. Mandate – Provide the ability to meet federal or state requirement to reduce the risk of legal non-compliance. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Substantial additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Additional penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds within the next 5 years are possible but not likely. 0-5 Little or no benefit or cost/risk avoidance from compliance. Penalties, political repercussion, litigation costs or loss of funds are unlikely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific mandated requirements have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from compliance. 3-5 Mandated requirements have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 General mandates have been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 11 | 0 |
| E. Operational Necessity – Provide the ability for an agency to continue to function in the case where business needs or technology changes have created an outdated system. Score: 11-15 High benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Critical service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a large portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 2 years. 6-10 Medium benefit or cost/risk avoidance. Some service reduction, outages or business changes affecting a portion of the agency or customer base will occur within the next 5 years. 0-5 Little benefit or cost/risk. Minimal service reduction, outages or business changes are likely in the next 5 years. Confidence measure: 0-2 Specific service areas at risk and a measure of the impact have been identified along with measurable benefits or avoided costs resulting from implementation. 3-5 Specific service areas at risk and general impact have been identified but alternative solutions have not been identified and avoided costs or measurable benefits have not been documented. 6-8 A general business need or risk has been identified but the impact is unclear. | | 15 | 0 |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|------|-----|
| Number of Benefits | 5 | Sub-total Score | 67 | 8 |
| Average Benefit Score: Sub-total Score Divided by Number of Benefits | | | 13.4 | 1.6 |
| Highest Benefit Score | | | 15 | 0 |

| Enterprise Benefits | | Range | |
|--|---|-------|--------------|
| For projects that benefit multiple agencies, add a bonus factor as follows: Indicate N/A if it does not apply. | | Score | Score - C.M. |
| F. | Enterprise Benefit – Duplication of technologies, costs or processes by multiple agencies will be eliminated or avoided. Score: 4-5 The project represents an enterprise solution that will benefit most agencies. 2-3 The project represents a solution that will benefit several agencies with common processes or functions. 1-2 The project represents a solution that will benefit to at least 2 agencies. Confidence measure (C.M.): 0 Agencies identified have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution and overall benefits have been documented. 1 A number of key agencies have committed to participate in the project or adopt the solution. 2 Agencies identified have indicated an interest in participating in the project or adopting the solution. | 5 | 0 |
| Total Average Benefit Score: Average Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 18.4 | 1.6 |
| Total Highest Benefit Score: Highest Benefit Score Plus Enterprise Benefit Score | | 20 | 0 |

| Relative Achievability – Financial Considerations | | Range | |
|---|---|-------------|---------------|
| | | Most likely | Not to exceed |
| A. | Investment Cost – Cost to implement the project along with a measure of the accuracy of the estimate. Estimated Investment Cost (Most likely): IT budget request \$2,100,000 General funds 100% \$2,100,000 Other project costs \$ _____ General funds _____ % _____ \$ Total project cost \$2,100,000 General funds 100% \$2,100,000 | \$2,100,000 | \$2,200,000 |
| B. | Ongoing Cost – The cost to maintain the system on an ongoing basis represented as a change to the current cost of operation. A measure of the accuracy of the estimate is included. Estimated Ongoing Annual Cost Change (Most likely): Change in operating cost \$10,000 General funds 100 % \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$11,000 |
| Total 5 year cost impact | | 2,150,000 | 2,255,000 |
| Total Cost Score = Total 5 year cost impact / 100,000 | | 21.5 | 22.55 |
| Total 5 year cost impact to general fund | | 2,150,000 | 2,255,000 |
| General Fund Score = Total 5 year cost impact to general fund / 100,000 | | 21.5 | 22.55 |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Relative Achievability – Risk Factors | | Score |
|--|--|--------------|
| Score all risks from the following list. A higher score indicates less risk or greater likelihood of project success due to the absence of risk factors. | | |
| A. Project Management Risk – A rating that reflects the availability of an experienced project manager and the agency's ability to administer a large project. Score: 4-5 The agency management has successfully executed IT projects of this size and complexity in the past. A sponsor and a project manager with experience on projects of this size and complexity have been identified. 2-3 The agency management has some experience with the successful completion of IT projects. A sponsor and a project manager with some experience have been identified. 0-1 The agency management has little experience managing projects. Project management will be outsourced, but the provider has not been identified and may be the vendor. A project sponsor has not been named. | | 5 |
| B. Technology Risk – A rating that reflects whether this project uses standard, mainstream technologies with which we have experience (low risk) or new, untried or poorly suited technologies (high risk). Score: 4-5 A technology approach is planned that aligns with the enterprise architecture future state. The implementation team has experience with the technology. 2-3 An acceptable technology approach has been found. The technology has been implemented for this type of application in other states or other locations and appears to be viable for the foreseeable future. 0-1 A technology approach has not been planned or the implementation team has no experience with the technology. Or use of the chosen technology is diminishing to the point where replacement may be required before the benefits are realized. | | 5 |
| C. Project Complexity – A rating that reflects the size and complexity of the project. Projects that involve multiple organizational units, involve business processes that are complex or have not been automated previously would be higher risk. Projects involving a single organizational unit, a simple process or are a rewrite of system that is already automated to a large degree would be lower risk. Score: 4-5 The project involves a single agency or process and will be completed by no more than two performing organizations. The tasks are well defined and can be completed in less than 9 months. 2-3 The project involves multiple agencies or multiple processes within an agency. Some design and process reengineering may be required to achieve the benefits. The tasks can be completed in less than eighteen months. 0-1 The project involves multiple processes across more than one agency or program. Significant design and reengineering of processes is necessary to achieve the benefits. Or the project will take longer than eighteen months to complete. | | 3 |
| D. Parameters and Constraints – A rating to quantify the availability of human resources to complete the project, scheduling constraints or political factors that may impact risk. Score: 4-5 Adequate resources are available to the project with enough contingency in the budget and the schedule to allow for unforeseen risks. The project primarily impacts internal processes or non-critical customer services. 2-3 Resources appear to be adequate for the project. There is adequate time to meet any external scheduling constraints. The project may involve political commitments or customer impact but quality assurance tasks have been identified. 0-1 Tight deadlines have been imposed due to mandates or funding streams. Human resources to staff the project are limited or the financial commitment may not be adequate. The project has high visibility due to political commitments or customer impact and quality assurance tasks have not been identified. | | 3 |
| Total Score | | 16 |